

We should not be putting at risk either an individual who works for the Government or the family of that individual who has gone overseas to live with that individual.

Fourth, we addressed the interrelationship of the Federal agencies and the State agencies, because although this is a uniquely Federal role, the role of protecting this country against terrorist action, there are tremendous strengths which can be drawn by a coordinated policy of State agencies.

So we took all this together and had a package that I think was put together in a fairly thoughtful and concise way. We came up with a need for additional dollars, about \$150 million. And we took money out of other accounts—other accounts—and moved them into the spending accounts which were necessary to pay for these additional resources to improve our efforts relative to terrorists.

Now the White House comes along, and they increase that number from \$150 million to \$300-plus million. There is some overlap here. We are not absolutely sure what the dollar difference is, but let us presume the dollar difference is over \$100 million. Yet, in doing this, they have suggested no offsets; they have not suggested where we should take this money from. They said simply, let us put more money into this and that and more money into something else. That is not really a responsible way to do this.

To the extent more dollars are needed than the package which we put together, it should be paid for. We should recognize that the priority in protecting this country from terrorism is high enough so that those dollars that we are going to allocate to terrorism should represent a reallocation and should not just be used to aggravate the deficit. That is the first thing.

Second, if the White House's decision is to spend this additional money to expand those accounts, they have to do it in a coordinated way. This, I guess, is where I have my greatest concern.

I asked the Attorney General about this, and, of course, the Attorney General feels there is coordination. But as you look at what is going on, and how the different instances of terrorism that we have seen so far have occurred and how they have been reacted to, you sense maybe there is not as much coordination as there should be.

For example, has the President of the United States ever sat down with the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the CIA, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of State around the table, and said, "What is our strategy on approaching international terrorism? How do we get about anticipating a terrorist act against the United States?"

We are very good, I believe, once a terrorist act has occurred, in reacting and investigating. And the FBI, I am absolutely confident, will reach the bottom as to what happened, find out

what happened in the TWA situation and in the Atlanta situation and in the Saudi situation. But we should be ahead of that as much as possible, ahead of that curve. To be ahead of that curve, you simply have to have cooperation at the top, with the senior officials within the Government, and it has to be made a priority with the President. The President actually has to physically sit in that room for at least a few meetings and drive the process so that we get a substantive strategy, the purpose of which is to anticipate where the terrorist threat is coming from and be ready to take action prior to the incident occurring.

My sense is that although strides have been made in this area, and although there is a sincere effort on the part of all the major players, certainly in the Defense Department, the intelligence agency, the CIA, in the State Department, and at Justice, my sense still is that there is not an attitudinal approach which says, we intend to anticipate, we intend to coordinate, and we intend to have an effort which tries to strategically position ourselves to be ahead of the curve in the area of addressing the terrorist threat.

We should be approaching this with the same thought process that we used relative to the Soviet Union when we considered it to be a threat. When we saw the Soviet Union as a threat, basically the Defense Department spent an inordinate amount of time—not inordinate, an appropriate amount of time, a huge amount of time, dollars, resources and people on developing scenarios anticipating various events.

We do not have that type of structure. We do not have that type of dollar commitment or personnel commitment yet in the area of strategic planning. We have it in the area of reactive planning. It is improving. Just yesterday, the FBI asked that they be able to move 200 senior agents into the Terrorism Activist Unit, which is a very appropriate action to take, not putting green new agents into this area. We are putting our best into this area. That is a good decision by the Attorney General and the Director of the FBI. We are going to increase the terrorism functions within the FBI by 5 percent, so basically 10 percent of the FBI effort would be directed toward counterterrorism.

The fact is that we still do not have a strategic structure overlaying this. That strategic structure and how it gets overlayed and how the process gets evolved really has to come from the White House with the President. We are going to see, unfortunately, that the failure to have this type of a structure probably was one of the problems in Saudi Arabia. There will be a report coming out sometime next week that will point out that there was not adequate anticipation of the threat, even though there was knowledge of the threat, there was not adequate participation and anticipation of the threat, and that the senior officials

within the Government simply did not react properly.

Why did they not act properly? I think probably because there was not a protocol in place because there had been no strategic planning put in place for how to get ahead of the curb. We still are taking the view that we wait until the act occurs rather than taking the view that we go on the offensive.

I recognize that the White House is trying hard in this area and the administration is trying hard. I greatly admire the efforts of the Attorney General in this area. I think the effort is incomplete. We have recognized but have not yet absorbed the nature of this, its significance to us, and the fact that we as a nation are going to have to use all our resources, all our creativity and our imagination in order to address it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business until the hour of 11:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my understanding is at the hour of 11:30 there is, by previous consent, an opportunity for the Senator from Wyoming and others to make a presentation. I believe there is an opportunity following that for others of us to make presentations.

I wanted to introduce a piece of legislation and I will do that in just 5 minutes, but first I want to comment about the bill on the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for Senator BYRD, who is going to go down as one of the real greats in the U.S. Senate. I have great respect for the Senator from Washington, who is managing the bill on the floor. This is a bill in which there is a difficult job of reconciling almost unlimited wants with limited resources.

I want to mention one area, however, that we must address. It is not addressed here. It has not been addressed by the BIA, but we will have to address it here. It deals with the school called the Ojibwe School. That may not mean much to anybody in this body, but it is very important to those on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation.

The Ojibwe School is an education home for 400 students. These 400 students go to school on this Indian reservation in North Dakota in facilities that are fundamentally unsafe. If you go tour that school, you will see electrical wiring exposed, as I have seen; you will see students who have to go out in the middle of the winter into kind of an old, dilapidated trailer facility, one after another, stacked up in order to house the children and provide for their schooling.

This Ojibwe School should have been provided with a new school years and years ago. It was once on a priority list and somehow it got dropped off that list. There is a current priority list for construction, but the BIA cannot tell us how the priority list was arrived at, who is on it, or how it was constructed. This is a mess. One way or another this has to be addressed, because we cannot put 400 children in unsafe circumstances in this Ojibwe School. The BIA and our Congress has a responsibility.

I almost feel that we must think about having 400 children look at the people who walk in the door of the BIA or through the front doors of Congress every morning until we look in the eyes of those children and say, "We owe you a decent school to attend."

I must move on to another topic, but we will talk more about this later. I say this with the greatest respect to the people who are managing this bill. I say to the BIA, you must begin addressing these issues that deal with Indian children.

CRIME

Mr. DORGAN. In the next 3 or 4 minutes I will introduce a piece of legislation. It is late in the session, but I intend to push on this legislation in the next session of Congress, as well. It deals with crime.

One-third of all violent crimes in this country are committed by people who are under supervision. Under supervision means people on probation, parole, or pretrial release. One-third of all violent crimes are committed by people we know because they are already in our system. They are in jail and let out. In most cases, they are let out early. It does not take Dick Tracy to figure out who will commit the next crime. In most cases it is someone who has committed a previous crime.

Now, in the Federal system, which we control, we allow automatic good time for Federal prisoners. It is not supposed to be automatic because this Congress passed a piece of legislation, that I authored, that revoked automatic good time and said Federal prisoners will get good time only if the present system decides to bestow it upon them for exemplary behavior. The prison system interprets that differently and automatically gives every prisoner automatic good time off for good behavior. That is not what the Congress meant.

Now, I have a different idea. I think in the Federal system and also in the State and local system in the criminal justice system, we ought to have a system that says to people who commit violent crimes: "If you commit a violent crime you are going to go to prison and you will spend your entire term or sentence in jail." No good time off for good behavior. No rewards for doing well in prison. If you commit a violent act you will go to jail and stay in jail until the end of your sentence.

We do not run the State and local criminal justice system, but we do run the Federal system. Let me give an example of one Federal prisoner named Martin Link. In 1982, Martin Link grabbed a 15-year-old girl in an alley in St. Louis, MO, sodomized her and tried to rape her. In 1983, he forced another young girl into his car, took her to East St. Louis and raped her. He was sentenced to 20 years in Federal prison, and was released in 6 years because of a combination of good time credits and parole. Soon afterward, he got a year's probation for soliciting sex from an undercover agent. The next year, in 1990, he stole a car, but he was still on the streets in 1991 when he murdered an 11-year-old girl named Elissa Self-Braun while she was walking to her schoolbus from her home.

This fellow is awaiting death in the Federal prison system. But he, like so many others convicted of violent crimes, was walking our streets early because we still have in the Federal system good time off for good behavior for those who commit violent crimes—for all Federal prisoners. For those who commit violent acts, it seems to me we ought to say in this country: "Understand this, if you are a criminal and prepared to commit a violent act, there will be no reward for you once you get to prison." When you get to prison, whatever the judge says your sentence is, your sentence will be—no good time off for good behavior for those who commit violent crimes.

Do you know that there are more than 4,000 people who have been murdered in this country—murdered by people who should not have been on the streets to murder anybody? They should have been in jail, in prison, but they were let out early. Now, the prison system authorities say, "Well, we need incentives to make people behave in prison, and we need opportunities to tell people that if you behave behind bars, we will give you good time off for good behavior."

My interest is in establishing order on American streets. We don't do that by letting violent criminals out of prison before the end of their sentence. If they have trouble managing violent offenders in prison, think of what happens when those violent offenders get back on our streets.

Let me end where I started. One-third of all violent crimes committed in this country are committed by people who are on probation, parole, or pretrial release. We know who they are, we know what they do, and we know what they are going to do. We ought to decide to get smart on these issues. In the Federal system we can decide that they will spend the entire time in prison, without good time off for good behavior. I am introducing my legislation which would do that. I invite my colleagues to cosponsor it. Recognizing we won't be able to advance it this year, I hope next year we will be able to have a vote on this piece of legislation.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 11:30 a.m. having arrived, there will now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, with Senator THOMAS controlling the time between now and 12 noon.

APPOINTMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Secretary of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the appointment of Sheilah Mann, of Maryland, to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress for the 104th Congress, vice Richard N. Smith.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

AMERICANS HAVE TO MAKE CHOICES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as you know, for some time now, we have attempted to have the freshmen of the Senate come on to the floor, from time to time, to talk about issues we think are important. We call this "Freshman Focus." We appreciate this time to do that. I will be joined by at least one of my associates, very soon. Many of the others have departed for home.

Mr. President, we wanted to talk a little today about choices—choices that we have in a Government like ours, the one that President Lincoln said was a Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," which we all, of course, want to maintain. In order to do that, then each of us, as citizens, as the people who will run this Government, need to make choices, need to make decisions, and need, of course, to be as informed as we can be with respect to those choices.

In order to be informed voters, and in order to participate in those decisions that will guide the country, not only in the short term but in the long term, I think we have to decide what those fundamental choices are and then, of course, decide for ourselves how we approach them. And there are fundamental choices, choices that have impact over time, choices that affect this country and the way it is organized, in its purpose, and its goals—not just the short-term issues that sort of are instant gratification for each of us. Of course there are those, and we always like that. But the fact is that there are basic issues that really will affect the way we operate over the years, not only for those of us who are now voting, but for our kids and our grandchildren. Those are the ones that, it is my belief, we should really focus on and seek to bring out in our own minds, at least how important they are.